

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Vinguina 22313-1450 www.uepto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/993,800 11/28/2001 Maurice Coulombe 153-6B 8857 23863 7590 06/17/2003 LESPERANCE & MARTINEAU EXAMINER 1440 WEST SCHEUERMANN, DAVID W STE-CATHERINE ROOM 700 MONTREAL, QC H3G1R8 CANADA ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2834

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | 09/993,800   | COULOMBE, MAURICE  |
| Office   | · Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |
|  |   | David W. Scheuerma   |  |
| Period fo  | The MAILING DATE of this communication ap<br>or Reply   | pears on the cover she   | eet with the correspondence address  |
| THE I - External form of the control | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is loss than thirty (30) days, a represent of or reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ro to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 136(a). In no event, however, ly within the statutory minimum will apply and will expire SIX (i.e. cause the application to become | may a reply be timely filed  of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. |
| 1)🖂  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28  | November 2001  |  |
| 2a) 🗌  | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th   | nis action is non-final.   |  |
| 3) 🗌<br>Dispositi  | Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims  | ance except for forma<br>Ex parte Quayle, 193  | Il matters, prosecution as to the merits is 5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |
| 4) 🖾   | Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.   |  |  |
|  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra  | wn from consideration  | 1.   |
|  | Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |  |
| 6)🖂  | Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.  |  |  |
| 7)   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |  |
|  | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/con Papers  | or election requiremen   | t.   |
| 9) 🗌 -   | The specification is objected to by the Examine   | er.  |  |
| 10) 🔲 🧵  | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce  | pted or b) objected to   | by the Examiner.   |
|  | Applicant may not request that any objection to th  |  |  |
| 11) 🔲 🛚  | he proposed drawing correction filed on   | _ is: a)□ approved b   | disapproved by the Examiner.   |
|  | If approved, corrected drawings are required in re  | ply to this Office action.   |  |
| 12) 🔲 7  | he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | caminer.   |  |
| Priority u   | nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |  |  |
| 13)  | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigi   | n priority under 35 U.S  | S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |
| a)[  | ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   |  |  |
|  | 1. Certified copies of the priority document  | s have been received   |  |
|  | <ol><li>Certified copies of the priority document</li></ol>   | s have been received   | in Application No  |
|  | <ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the prio<br/>application from the International Bu<br/>ee the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ol>  | reau (PCT Rule 17.2)   | (a)).  |
| 14) 🗌 A  | cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti  | c priority under 35 U.   | S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  |
| a)   | ☐ The translation of the foreign language procknowledgment is made of a claim for domest  | visional application h   | as been received.  |
| Attachment   |   |  |  |
| 2) 🔲 Notice  | of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)<br>ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _  | 5) Notin   | view Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) se of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) r:  |

Application/Control Number: 09/993,800

Art Unit: 2834

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. The claimed invention is inoperative because it there are no unbalanced forces acting on the watercraft to provide motion over water. The claimed invention violates the conservation of momentum. The net result of the moving masses is balanced because they return to their starting points. Therefore there are no unbalanced forces acting of the watercraft to provide motion over water. It is well know that an object (a watercraft) remains at rest unless acted on by an unbalanced force. Moving masses on the watercraft will not result in the overall change of the momentum of the system.

When a patent applicant presents an application describing an invention that contradicts known scientific principles, or relies on previously undiscovered scientific phenomenon, the burden is on the examiner simply to point out this fact to the appellant... The burden shifts to appellant to demonstrate either that his invention, as claimed, is operable or does not violate basic scientific principles, or that those basic scientific principles are incorrect. As stated by the Patent Office Board of Appeals, Newman v. Quigg 681 F. Supp 16, at18, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1880(1988).

Applicant is required to furnish a working model of their invention in order to demonstrate its operability. See MPEP § 608.03.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Meriam on page 6 restates Newton's first law.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David W. Scheuermann whose telephone number is (703) 308-9637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

dws June 12, 2003 Mund